A meta-analysis approach to the effects of live prey on the growth of Octopus vulgaris paralarvae under culture conditions.

Journal:	*Reviews in Aquaculture*
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Garrido, Diego; IEO, Almansa, Eduardo; Instituto Español de Oceanografía – Centro Oceanográfico de Canárias, Martín, Virginia; IEO, Rodríguez, Covadonga; ULL, Iglesias, José; IEO, Navarro, Juan; IATS-CSIC, Hontoria, Francisco; IATS-CSIC, Becerro, Mikel; IMAP-CSIC, Otero, Juan; IEO, Pérez, Josu; IRTA,
Keywords:	Meta-analysis, Octopus vulgaris, Paralarvae, Growth, Prey, Artemia enrichment

A meta-analysis approach to the effects of live prey on the growth of *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae under culture conditions.

Garrido, D[1]., Martín, MV[1]., Rodríguez, C[2]., Iglesias, J[3]., Navarro, JC[5]., Estévez, A[4]., Hontoria, F[5]., Becerro, M[6]., Otero, JJ[3]., Pérez, J., Varó, I[5]., Reis, DB[1,2,8]., Riera, R[7]., Sykes, AV[8]., Almansa, E[1].*

[1]Centro Oceanográfico de Canarias. Instituto Español de Oceanografía. Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain

[2]Departamento de Biología Animal, Geología y Edafología, Universidad de La Laguna. San Cristóbal de La Laguna, Spain

[3]Centro Oceanográfico de Vigo. Instituto Español de Oceanografía. Vigo, Spain

[4]Instituto de Acuicultura Torre de la Sal (IATS-CSIC). Ribera de Cabanes, Castellón, Spain

[5]Institut de Recerca i Tecnologia Agroalimentàries (IRTA). Sant Carles de la Ràpita, Tarragona, Spain

[6]Instituto de Productos Naturales y Agrobiología (IMAP-CSIC). San Cristóbal de La Laguna, Spain

[7]Centro de Investigaciones Medioambientales del Atlántico (CIMA SL). Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain

[8]CCMAR - Centro de Ciências do Mar, Universidade do Algarve, Faro, Portugal

*Correspondence: Eduardo Almansa. Centro Oceanográfico de Canarias. Instituto Español de Oceanografía (IEO). Vía Espaldón. Darsena Pesquera. PCL 8. CP38180. Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain. Email: eduardo.almansa@ca.ieo.es. Tlf: +34922549400, Fax: +34922549554

A short running title: Meta-analysis on *Octopus* paralarval growth

Abstract

The common octopus (*Octopus vulgaris,* Cuvier 1797) is a promising species for aquaculture diversification, but the massive mortality during the first life stage is the main bottleneck for its commercial production. The aim of the present study was to compare the effects of different live preys (*Artemia* and crustacean zoeae) and/or *Artemia* enrichment protocols in the paralarval growth by using a meta-analysis approach. A total of 26 independent assays were used, including data from the bibliography and from experiments carried out by our group. Three comparisons were established: (i) crustacean zoeae *vs Artemia*, (ii) different crustacean zoeae species and (iii) *Artemia* enriched with marine lecithin (rich in polar lipids-PL and docosahexaenoic acid-DHA) *vs* previously used *Artemia* enrichments. The meta-analysis approach allowed a quantitatively review of independent studies with reliable conclusions, avoiding the subjectivity inherent to classical reviews. The outputs provided statistical confirmation of the better suitability of crustacean zoeae with respect to *Artemia*. However, not all crustacean species showed the same results, given that the high variability on *Grapsus* zoeae hampered finding significant differences with respect to the control treatment (*Artemia*). Nutrient composition and biometry of the different types of prey are discussed as possible causes of the differences arising from the meta-analysis. Finally, the present results suggest that marine lecithin has a beneficial effect on paralarval growth with respect to previously used enrichments, which could be related to the increase of DHA and PL in *Artemia*, given the essential role of these lipid components in octopus paralarval physiology.

Key words: Meta-analysis*, Octopus vulgaris*, Paralarvae, Growth, Prey

Introduction

The common octopus (*Octopus vulgaris,* Cuvier 1797) is a species with increasing interest for marine aquaculture diversification, given its high growth rate and easy adaptation to captivity, among other positive features (Iglesias *et al.* 2007; 2014a). However, the massive paralarvae mortalities verified under culture conditions (≈100% in most studies) have hampered its commercial production, therefore making this the main bottleneck for industrial farming. According to several authors (Iglesias *et al.* 2007, 2014a; Iglesias & Fuentes 2013), the high mortalities could be due to: (i) inadequate and/or unbalanced diets that do not fulfil paralarvae nutritional requirements; (ii) lack of standardized rearing techniques, and (iii) little knowledge about octopus paralarvae physiology and behaviour. Unlike benthic adults, newly hatched paralarvae have a pelagic behaviour that lasts for about two months. Thereafter, octopus progressively acquires benthic habits (Villanueva & Norman 2008).

Paralarvae fed crustacean zoeae such as *Maja* or *Pagurus* in co-feeding with *Artemia* have shown the highest growth rates, ranging between 7-8 % dry weight·day^{-1}, and attain a development that facilitates their shift from a pelagic to a benthonic life stage (Villanueva 1994; Iglesias *et al.* 2004; Carrasco *et al.* 2006). In addition, Roura *et al.* (2012) has recently shown that, in the wild, paralarvae prey on an wide list of different preys, where crustacean zoeae are preferably selected. However, it is not economically viable to produce crustacean zoeae for feeding octopus paralarvae due to the high commercial value of these crustacean species and the lack technology to produce those (Andrés *et al.* 2007; 2010). As a result, current research has been focused on the use of *Artemia*, which is the standard live prey used in marine larviculture (Sorgeloos *et al.* 2001). However, *Artemia* displays a nutritional profile less suitable for octopus paralarvae than zoeae of crustaceans, even after enrichment (Navarro & Villanueva

2000; Bell *et al.* 2003; Hormiga *et al*. 2010). Most studies of *O. vulgaris* culture using *Artemia* have promoted paralarvae growth rates between 2-4% dry weight ·day^{-1} (Navarro & Villanueva 2000; Villanueva *et al.* 2004; Estévez *et al.* 2009; Seixas et al. 2010a,b; Reis *et al.* 2014a), while few authors have reported growth rates over 6% (Villanueva *et al.* 2002; Okumura *et al.* 2005; Kurihara *et al.* 2006; Arai *et al.* 2008; Fuentes *et al.* 2011; Viciano *et al.* 2011).

Artemia nutritional lipid profile presents low levels of polar lipids (PL) and highly unsaturated fatty acids (HUFA), especially docosahexaenoic acid (22:6n-3, DHA) (Navarro *et al.* 1993), and these are of particular relevance for octopus paralarvae development, as initially suggested by Navarro and Villanueva (2000). Recent studies carried out in the research project OCTOPHYS (see acknowledgements section for details) have shown that octopus has little or no ability to synthesize HUFA such as DHA, eicosapentanoic acid (20:5n-3, EPA) and arachidonic acid (20:4n-6, ARA) (Monroig *et al.* 2013; Reis *et al.* 2014b), supporting the essential nature of these fatty acids (FA). In addition, several studies conducted by Guinot *et al.* (2013a,b) have shown an increase of PL and HUFA content in *Artemia*, using marine phospholipids (Marine lecithin LC60, LC) as enrichment. .

On the other hand, the high variability in paralarval growth found among studies, using similar diets, is still a main concern that needs to be solved to provide reproducibility under culture conditions. The differences observed among studies could be partially explained by several factors such as: shifts in nutritional live prey composition (e.g. enrichment process, prey origin), rearing conditions (e.g. tank volume, light intensity, density of paralarvae and/or preys) or even spawn quality (e.g. female size, origin, eggs incubation temperature) (Iglesias *et al.* 2007, 2014b; Villanueva & Norman 2008).

An approach to overcome these problems is to standardise paralarval production and culture protocols among different centres. To reach this goal, different preys, enrichments and rearing conditions were tested under project OCTOPHYS, including the use of *Artemia* enriched with LC as food for *O. vulgaris* paralarvae. Even though, this strategy still produced a large volume of information together with that already available in literature. In this sense, a meta-analysis approach allows the comparison of results from independent studies to get reliable conclusions and avoid subjectivity and variability (Walker *et al.* 2008). The methodology used in this study can only be applied in experiments that have experimental and control treatments with their own mean, standard deviation and number of replicates. To compare different studies, the meta-analysis has different phases: (1) search and selection of studies, (2) estimation of treatment effect (effect size), calculated as experimental treatment minus control treatment or *vice versa,* for each study, as well as the effect size across all studies (overall), (3) assessment of data precision measured as confidence interval, which indicates the accuracy of the effect size estimation, and (4) search for data heterogeneity and explore data robustness, quantifying the scattering of the effect sizes across studies (Borenstein *et al.* 2010; Higgins & Green 2011).

In the present review, data from published literature regarding *O. vulgaris* paralarvae rearing, as well as data from the OCTOPHYS project and other experiments were considered using a meta-analysis approach aiming to compare: (i) the effects of crustacean zoeae *vs Artemia*, (ii) the effects of different crustacean zoeae species and (iii) the effect of *Artemia* enriched with Marine Lecithin LC60 (LC) *vs.* other *Artemia* enrichments; on paralarvae growth.

Materials and Methods

An integrative meta-analysis was performed with data obtained from published literature and from different trials carried out, under project OCTOPHYS, in three research centres: Institute for Research & Technology Food & Agriculture, IR (Tarragona, Spain); Spanish Institute of Oceanography: Oceanographic Center of the Canary Islands, TF (Tenerife, Spain) and Oceanographic Center of Vigo, VG (Vigo, Spain). Details about the studies included in the meta-analysis are summarized in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 and in the sections below.

Reference papers

A total of 98 and 49 scientific contributions were found in April 2014 in the Web of Science and Scopus, respectively, using the key-word: *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae. Other bibliography sources such as JACUMAR (Spanish National Advisory Board for Marine Aquaculture) reports, conference communications and PhD theses dealing with paralarval culture, were also considered. However, it should be emphasized that only 5 papers of Web of Science and Scopus, 1 PhD Thesis and 1 conference communication, presented the data as required by the meta-analysis (experimental and control treatments, mean, standard deviation and number of replicates). These references yield a total of 11 bibliographic inputs used (see Table 1)

Rearing conditions

Specific experiments were performed and data of paralarval rearing conditions is summarized according to: a) Rearing conditions (Table 2), b) The on-growing *Artemia* (Table 3) and c) Prey enrichment and feeding (Table 4). Broodstock conditions were as described by Reis *et al.* (2014a) for IR and TF and Iglesias *et al.* (2014a) for VG.

Newly hatched paralarvae were cultured in fiberglass cylinder-conical tanks (conditions are summarized in Table 2). In IR, tanks were connected to a recirculation unit

IRTAMar™. Physicochemical parameters such as oxygen, salinity and temperature were measured daily and nitrite and ammonium once a week. Dissolved oxygen levels were kept close to saturation and nitrite and ammonia were <0.3 mg L^{-1} and 0 mg L^{-1}, respectively in all experiments. Salinity and temperature data are shown in Table 2.

Diverse types of commercial *Artemia* were used in trials to compare different *Artemia* enrichment techniques (see experiments 1 to 11 in Table 3) and as the control diet in the experiments with zoeae (see experiments 12 to 15 in Table 3). In all experiments, *Artemia* nauplii were obtained from cysts that hatched in fiberglass cylinder-conical tanks for 24h at 28ºC, with 37 PSU, vigorous aeration and 2000lx. Table 4 shows the on-growing *Artemia* parameters used in several experiments. After the on-growing period, *Artemia* enrichments were carried out as described in Table 3 for different experiments. *Artemia* was given to paralarvae once a day in all experiments, except for experiments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8 where this prey was supplied three times per day. In these experiments, previous to its use as food, *Artemia* were kept at 4°C, without any light, and under gentle aeration to avoid metabolization of the enrichment.

Crustacean zoeae of different species were used as experimental diet in experiments 12 to 15 (Tables 2 and 3). *Maja brachydactyla* zoeae (experiments 13 and 14) were obtained as described by Iglesias *et al.* (2014a). The production methodology and handling of *Grapsus adscensionis* zoea and *Palaemon sp.* zoea (experiments 12 and 15) were as described in Reis *et al.* (2014a).

The *Artemia* cysts were obtained from INVE Aquaculture (Dendermonde, Belgium), fresh *Nannochloropsis* sp. was supplied by Necton, Companhia Portuguesa de Culturas Marinhas, S.A. (Olhão, Portugal), freeze dried *Isochrysis galbana., Nannochloropsis* sp. and *Tetraselmis chuii* by Fitoplancton marino S.L (Cádiz, Spain), *Haematococcus pluvialis* was provided by Sainhall Nutrihealth Pte Ltd (Singapour), Marine lecithin

LC60 (LC) was supplied by PhosphoTech Laboratories (St. Herblain, France) and Gemma Diamond 0.8 was supplied by Skretting Spain S.A. (Burgos. Spain).

Paralarvae dry weight was determined individually, after oven drying for 20 h at 110°C, as described by Iglesias *et al.* (2014a).

All the experiments were performed according to the Spanish Law 6/2013 based on the Directive 2010/63/EU regarding the protection and humane use of animals for scientific purposes.

Statistical Analysis

The effect of different treatments on dry weight of octopus paralarvae was tested and compared through meta-analysis (Borenstein *et al.* 2010). The methodology used in this study can only be applied in experiments that have experimental and control treatments with their own mean, standard deviation and number of replicates (Table 1). The estimation of treatment effect (effect size) was calculated as the differences on dry weight of paralarvae in the experimental treatment minus control treatment or *vice versa* for each study (See Table 1), as well as the effect size across all studies (overall). The effect size was calculated by standardized mean difference (Hedges's g, Hedges 1981). Due to the different origins of prey and paralarvae, and rearing methodologies used in the research centres, it was assumed that each study had its own error. Therefore, the Random effects model (Cochran's Q) was used, employing the Comprehensive Meta-analysis software (Biostat, Englewood, USA).

In the meta-analysis plots, the effect size on the left from vertical axis indicated that a given experimental treatment improved the dry weight of paralarvae respect to control, when the confidence interval of 95% (CI) rank did not intercept the vertical axis. To confirm the correct choice of the Random effects model, the variability among studies

was run as comparable heterogeneity analysis (Q). *P* value <0.05 was considered significant.

Results and Discussion

Crustacean zoeae vs Artemia

Crustacean zoeae have been tested in different studies as a suitable prey for octopus paralarval culture, generally achieving better results than *Artemia* (Iglesias & Fuentes 2013; Iglesias *et al.* 2014b). However, this fact has not been quantified comparing the data sets from different studies through a meta-analysis.

A total of 26 inputs, 7 using crustacean zoeae (see Table 1, inputs 12 to 18) and 19 using *Artemia* (see Table 1, inputs 1 to 11 and 19 to 26) were analysed. After the bibliographic research, only the references which fulfil to meta-analysis requirements were included in the statistical analysis. Some studies could not be included due to the lack of a control treatment or standard deviation (e.g. Itami *et al.* 1963; Villanueva 1995; Navarro & Villanueva 2000; Moxica *et al.* 2002; Iglesias *et al.* 2004, Socorro *et al.,* 2004; Carrasco *et al.* 2006; Moxica *et al.* 2006; Iglesias *et al.* 2014a).

Results obtained in the meta-analysis are shown in Figure 1. The overall model (Overall) showed a significant increase on paralarval dry weight of (p=0.001) derived from the individuals fed with zoeae, which displayed a positive effect (p=0.001). Contrarily, *Artemia* was represented on the right side of the vertical axis indicating that this prey did not improve the dry weight of *O. vulgaris* paralarvae (p=0.654). Zoeae and *Artemia* showed heterogeneity (Q=29.05, p<0.05).

The meta-analysis results confirm statistically the suitability of crustacean zoeae compared to *Artemia* in paralarval culture. This conclusion is in agreement with

previous studies using crustacean zoeae (Itami *et al.* 1963; Villanueva 1995, Moxica *et al.* 2002; Iglesias *et al.* 2004; Morote *et al.* 2005, Socorro *et al.* 2005; Carrasco *et al.* 2006; Iglesias *et al.* 2007, 2014a) or *Artemia* under different enrichments (Navarro & Villanueva 2000; Moxica *et al.* 2006; De Wolf *et al.* 2011). Similarly, Iglesias and Fuentes (2013) pointed out that the growth obtained adding zoea can be six-fold higher than that achieved with *Artemia.* Furthermore, paralarvae fed with zoeae in some cases reached the benthic stage (Itami *et al.* 1963; Villanueva 1995; Iglesias *et al.* 2004; Carrasco *et al.* 2006). In contrast, settlement of paralarvae fed with *Artemia* has rarely been achieved, requiring a longer rearing period than paralarvae fed with zoeae (Moxica *et al.* 2006; De Wolf *et al.* 2011). Several studies using *Artemia* (Moxica *et al.* 2006; Fuentes *et al.* 2011; Viciano *et al.* 2011) displayed a higher dry weight gain at 30 days, reaching 1.6-1.8 mg (SGR of 5-6%·DW day^{-1}) but this is still below that achieved with crustacean zoeae (2.5-3.5 mg, SGR of 7-8%·DW day^{-1}; Villanueva 1995; Iglesias *et al.* 2004; Carrasco *et al.* 2006; Iglesias *et al.* 2014a).

The better results obtained using zoeae may be due to prey size or prey nutritional composition. Usually, the different zoeae species used in the octopus' culture display greater length (1.3-3.4 mm) than *Artemia* metanauplii (0.8-2 mm) (Villanueva & Norman 2008), which could increase the biomass ingested by paralarvae during each act of feeding thereby reducing energy expenditure of hunting multiple preys to obtain the necessary daily requirements, leading to higher growth. Previous studies have shown the paralarval preference for large prey (Iglesias *et al.* 2006), being able to capture preys between 45 to 118% of paralarvae total length (Villanueva & Norman, 2008).

Another relevant aspect is the composition of prey, specifically the HUFA and DHA contents. Similar to what has been widely demonstrated in fish larvae, the importance of DHA in the physiology of paralarvae may be related with visual and neuronal

development as have been suggested by numerous studies (Tocher, 2010, Navarro and Villanueva, 2000; 2003 and Takeuchi, 2014). Newly hatched *O. vulgaris* display a high DHA content ranging between 17-27% of total FA (Navarro & Villanueva 2000; Okumura *et al.* 2005; Kurihara *et al.* 2006; Aria *et al.* 2008; Seixas *et al.* 2010a,b; Reis *et al.* 2014a), similar to the levels observed in recently settled wild juveniles with 15-25% of total FA, (Navarro & Villanueva 2003). In contrast, the DHA content tended to gradually decrease (46-76% from hatching to 30 days old) in paralarvae fed exclusively on *Artemia*, regardless of the enrichment used (Navarro & Villanueva 2000; Estévez *et al.* 2009; Seixas *et al.* 2010a,b; Reis *et al.* 2014a). Nevertheless, paralarvae were able to maintain the original levels of DHA throughout development when were fed on a mixture of *Artemia* and sand eel (*Ammodytes personatus*) flakes (Okumura *et al.* 2005).

O. vulgaris shows little or no ability to synthesise DHA, as reported by Monroig *et al.* (2013) and Reis *et al.* (2014b). Therefore, this FA should be provided in the diet at appropriate levels. While, spider crab zoeae display levels of DHA between 8.7-15.8 % of total FA (Seixas 2009; Andrés *et al.* 2010 and Iglesias *et al.* 2014a), the basal levels of DHA in *Artemia* are negligible (0.1% DHA; Okumura *et al.* 2005; Reis *et al.* 2014a). The use of different enrichment techniques has improved up to 2.3 and 8.0% of DHA (Navarro & Villanueva 2000 and Seixas *et al.* 2010a respectively, among others). Paralarval viability was slightly improved with these *Artemia* enrichments, but it was not enough to maintain DHA levels in paralarvae (Navarro & Villanueva 2000; Estévez *et al.* 2009; Seixas *et al.* 2010a, b; Reis *et al.* 2014a; Takeuchi 2014).

These differences between zoea and *Artemia* can be due to other factors related to the bioavailability of DHA. In most species, DHA is mainly esterified in polar lipids (PL), such as phosphatidylethanolamine or phosphatidylcholine (Kanazawa & Shunsuke 1994; Salhi *et al.* 1999). However, Bell *et al.* (2003) showed that *Artemia* enriched with

DHA accumulated most of this FA in neutral lipid (NL). More recently, Guinot *et al.* (2013b) obtained a similar esterification into NL even when DHA was provided as PL to *Artemia* during enrichment. In fish and cephalopods, diets containing PL have higher apparent lipid digestibility than diets containing high amount of NL, due to the emulsifying properties of PL that improve their digestion and absorption by larvae (Koven *et al.* 1993; Morillo-Velarde *et al.* 2014; Olsen *et al.* 2014). This could be due to the absence of lipid emulsifiers in the digestive tract of cephalopods (Vonk 1962; O'Dor *et al.* 1984). Accordingly, these results suggest that *Artemia* metabolism, which allocates DHA in the NL fraction, could diminish the bioavailability of this FA compared to crab zoeae.

Other nutrients such as copper, aminoacids (AA) or vitamins might have an influence on the dry weight of paralarvae. Copper plays an essential role in oxygen transport as a constituent of hemocyanin, the main respiratory pigment in cephalopods. In addition, copper content decreases when paralarvae are fed with *Artemia* nauplii (from 217 $\mu g \cdot g^{-1}$ DW in hatchlings to 92 $\mu g \cdot g^{-1}$ DW in 20 days-old paralarvae (Villanueva & Bustamante 2006). This could be related with the low copper content of *Artemia* (7 $\mu g \cdot g^{-1}$ DW), which contrast with the values found in *M. brachydactyla* zoea (73 $\mu g \cdot g^{-1}$ DW) (Villanueva & Bustamante 2006). On the other hand, the profile of total aminoacids does not seem to be a limiting factor, since the composition of enriched *Artemia* metanauplii, *Pagurus prideaux* zoea and *M. squinado* zoea is similar (Villanueva *et al.* 2004). As regards the vitamin content, enriched *Artemia* (DC Super Selco and L-methionine) and *M. brachydactyla* zoea, have similar vitamin E content (428 and 584 $\mu g \cdot g^{-1}$ DW, respectively) (Villanueva *et al.* 2009). Moreover, the contents of other nutrients not yet evaluated may be important, namely carotenoids, carbohydrates, other vitamins, etc.

Relation among zoeae from different crustacean species

O. vulgaris paralarvae have been fed on several crustacean species such as *M. brachydactyla* (Moxica *et al.* 2002; Iglesias *et al.* 2004; 2014a; Carrasco *et al.,* 2006), *Grapsus adscensionis* (Socorro *et al.* 2005; Reis *et al.* 2014a), *Palaemon sp.* (Socorro *et al.* 2005; Estevez *et al*., 2009; Reis *et al.* 2014a), *P. prideaux* (Villanueva 1995), *Linocarcinus depurator* (Villanueva 1995), *Acartia sp.* (Iglesias *et al.* 2007; Estevez *et al*., 2009) and *Palaemon serratus*, *Moina salina* and *Maja squinado* (Morote *et al.* 2005). The results obtained among different studies suggest a species-specific effect on paralarval viability, which was tested through the meta-analysis.

Nevertheless, the lack of fulfilment of experimental requirements for the meta-analysis comparison in many of these studies entail that only 7 inputs from 4 crustacean genera (*Maja, Palaemon, Grapsus* and the copepod *Acartia*) could be used to compare the effects of different species within the zoea group (see Table 1, inputs 12 to 18). Results are presented in Figure 2. The overall model confirmed the positive effect of feeding octopus paralarvae with crustacean zoea species (p=0.001). However, not all crustacean species showed the same results, with *Grapsus* zoeae displaying no significant differences with respect to the control treatment, probably due to the high variability in the confidence interval. It also has to be considered that this analysis did not show heterogeneity (Q=5.08, p=0.166), due to the size effects showing similar values and their confidence interval (CI) overlapping among studies.

These results obtained in the meta-analysis related to *G. adscensionis zoeae* were probably due to its lower nutritional value, given that this species showed a lower DHA content (2.6% of total fatty acids, Reis *et al.* 2014a) when compared with *M. brachydactyla* (12.8%-15.1%, Andrés *et al.* 2010; Iglesias *et al.* 2014a), *P. elegans* (13.4%, Reis *et al.* 2014a), *P. prideaux* (18.1%, Navarro & Villanueva 2000) or the

297 mysid *Acanthomysis longicornis* (24.0%, Navarro & Villanueva 2000). It should be
298 noted also that *G. adscensionis* is a species with relatively lower copper content
299 (7.4±2.5 µg g^{-1} DW, Martin *et al.* 2011) when compared with *M. brachydactyla* (50.0-
300 72.5 µg g^{-1} DW, Andrés *et al.* 2010; Villanueva & Bustamante 2006). In addition, the
301 size of *G. adscensionis* could influence the results obtained, since this species has a
302 smaller carapace length (CL) and lower DW (0.45 mm and 0.02 mg, respectively) than
303 other zoeae species, such as *L. depurator* (CL 0.52 mm), *P. prideaux* (CL 1.18 mm),
304 *Dardanus arrosor* (CL 1.44 mm) (Villanueva 1994) and *M. brachydactyla* (CL 1.01
305 mm and DW 0.109 mg) (Andrés *et al.* 2007).

306 Paralarvae fed on *Maja* and *Palaemon* zoeae as well as *Acartia* showed increased DW
307 with respect to the control group (*Artemia*), confirming the positive effects of these
308 zoeae in paralarval growth. However, the fluctuations in quality regarding biochemical
309 composition (among other features) of newly hatched zoeae or copepods throughout the
310 year, the lack of specific culture technology, and the economic value of these species
311 (many of them used for human consumption) have hampered its commercial production
312 for paralarvae culture (Andrés *et al.* 2007, 2010). In consequence, further studies are
313 necessary with the aim to produce high quality enriched *Artemia* with appropriate
314 nutritional profiles to meet the requirements of *O. vulgaris* paralarvae.

315 ***Effects of marine phospholipids on Artemia enrichment using Marine lecithin LC60***
316 ***vs other enrichments***

317 As previously mentioned, DHA and PL seem to be essential in the physiology of
318 octopus paralarvae. However, *Artemia* shows a profile poor in these lipid components.
319 Guinot *et al.* (2013a,b) have demonstrated that the use of marine phospholipids such as
320 marine lecithin LC60® (LC) as enrichment improved the content of DHA and PL in
321 *Artemia*. Therefore, the next step was to compare the effect of this product on paralarval

DW gain with other *Artemia* enrichments, tested either individually or in combination. The enrichments considered were different phytoplankton species (*Isochrysis* galbana, *Nannochloropsis* sp., *Haematococcus pluvialis*, *Tetraselmis chuii*, *Rhodomonas lens*), free L-amino acids (lysine, arginine, and methionine), commercial enrichments (Ori-Gold®, DC Super Selco®, Easy DHA-Selco®), M70 (a lipid enrichment used by Viciano *et al.* 2011) and crushed wild zooplankton (see Table 1 and 4). Other enrichments such as *Phaeodactylum tricornutum*, Krill powder, Red-pepper®, Algamac®, Multigain®, Ori-Prot®, Ori-Culture® and Ori-Green® have been cited in the literature, but they were not included in the meta-analysis due to the lack of statistical requirements.

Finally, a total of 19 inputs were used, 9 for LC (see Tables 1 and 4, inputs 1 to 9) and 10 for other *Artemia* enrichments (see Tables 1 and 4, inputs 10, 11 and 19 to 26). *Artemia* fed with LC improved paralarvae DW (p=0.014), whereas other *Artemia* enrichments showed a decreased in DW (p=0.044) (Figure 3). Results from the overall model (which include LC as well as other enrichments) did not show any significant effect on paralarval DW (p=0.259), since differences between LC and other *Artemia* enrichments displayed high heterogeneity (Q=8.84, p=0.003). These results suggest that marine phospholipids (LC) seem to have a beneficial effect on paralarvae, with respect to other enrichments, improving their growth.

In addition, the use of *Artemia* enriched with LC promoted a slight increase of the HUFA content (including DHA) in paralarvae when compared with other *Artemia* enrichments (8.3 *vs* 6.2 % DHA of the total FA, respectively) (Garrido *et al.* 2013). Moreover, the use of the LC enrichment promoted an increase of the PL fraction in *Artemia* (Guinot *et al.* 2013b). Therefore, the beneficial effects of LC on paralarval dry weight gain could be related to an improvements in lipid composition of *Artemia*. However, further studies are necessary to establish the lipid requirements of paralarvae

during their pelagic stage (especially in HUFA and PL) as well as the metabolism and bioavailability of these lipid components in *Artemia* and in other suitable types of prey for *O. vulgaris* paralarvae.

Conclusions

In summary, using selected data from independent studies, the meta-analysis showed significant differences in paralarvae fed with crustacean zoeae *vs Artemia*, where the use of zoeae resulted in a better performance of *O. vulgaris* paralarvae displaying a net positive effect on growth (dry weight). Nevertheless, not all the zoeae species displayed a similar growth enhancement, given that the high variability on *Grapsus* zoeae hampered finding significant differences with respect to the control treatment. Finally, results suggest that *Artemia* enrichment with marine lecithin has a beneficial effect on paralarval growth compared to other *Artemia* enrichments, which could be related to the increase of DHA and PL, given the essential role of these lipid components in the paralarval physiology.

Acknowledgements

This survey was funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Spanish Government) under Project OCTOPHYS (Ref. AGL2010-22120-C03) and Canary Goverment (Spain) under Project PRESAPUL (PI 2008/162). A.V. Sykes was funded by FCT through Programa Investigador FCT 2014 (IF/00576/2014). D Garrido was financed by Ph.D. grant by Spanish Institute of Oceanography (BOE 3rd November 2011). We thank Dr. Deiene Rodríguez Barreto and Dr. Karl Blyth Andree for their useful revision and assistance with clarification of the manuscript.

371 **References**

372 Andrés M, Estévez A, Rotllant G (2007) Growth, survival and biochemical composition
373 of spider crab *Maja brachydactyla* (Balss, 1922) (Decapoda: Majidae) larvae reared
374 under different stocking densities, prey: larva ratios and diets. *Aquaculture* **273**: 494-
375 502.

376 Andrés M, Estévez A, Simeó CG, Rotllant G (2010) Annual variation in the
377 biochemical composition of newly hatched larvae of *Maja brachydactyla* in captivity.
378 *Aquaculture* **310**: 99-105.

379 Arai D, Kurihara A, Komi R, Iwamoto A, Takeuchi T (2008) Effects of feeding various
380 amounts of pacific sandeel flakes on growth, survival and carcass fatty acid composition
381 of common Octopus *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae. *Aquaculture Science*, **56**: 595-600.

382 Bell JG, McEvoy LA, Estevez A, Shields RJ, Sargent JR (2003) Optimising lipid
383 nutrition in first-feeding flatfish larvae. *Aquaculture* **227**: 211-220.

384 Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR (2010) A basic introduction to
385 fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*
386 **1**: 97-111.

387 Carrasco JF, Arronte JC, Rodríguez C (2006) Paralarval rearing of the common
388 octopus, *Octopus vulgaris* (Cuvier). *Aquaculture Research* **37**: 1601-1605.

389 De Wolf T, Lenzi S, Lenzi F (2011) Paralarval rearing of *Octopus vulgaris* (Cuvier) in
390 Tuscany, Italy. *Aquaculture Research* **42**: 1406-1414.

391 Estévez A, Gairin I, Berger E (2009) Wild zooplancton for *Octopus vulgaris* larval
392 rearing. In: Hendry CI, Van Stappen G, Wille M, Sorgeloos P (ed.) LARVI 09, Fish &

393 shellfish larviculture symposium, special publication No. 38. European Aquaculture
394 Society, Oostende, pp 88–91.

395 Fuentes L, Sánchez FJ, Lago MJ, Iglesias J, Pazos G, Linares F. (2011) Growth and
396 survival of *Octopus vulgaris* (Cuvier 1797) paralarvae fed on three Artemia-based diets
397 complemented with frozen fish flakes, crushed zooplankton and marine microalgae.
398 *Scientia Marina* **75**: 771-777.

399 Garrido D, Martín MV, Rodríguez C, Acosta NG, Santamaría FJ, Felipe BC *et al.*
400 (2013) Efecto del enriquecimiento de *Artemia* con fosfolípidos marinos sobre el
401 crecimiento, supervivencia y composición lipídica de paralarvas de pulpo común
402 (*Octopus vulgaris*). *XIV Congreso Nacional de Acuicultura* (Gijón, Spain) pp.224-226.

403 Guinot D, Monroig Ó, Navarro JC, Varó I, Amat F, Hontoria F (2013a). Enrichment of
404 *Artemia* metanauplii in phospholipids and essential fatty acids as a diet for common
405 octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*) paralarvae. *Aquaculture Nutrition* **19**: 837-844.

406 Guinot D, Monroig Ó, Hontoria F, Amat F, Varó I, Navarro JC (2013b) Enriched on-
407 grown *Artemia* metanauplii actively metabolise highly unsaturated fatty acid-rich
408 phospholipids. *Aquaculture* **412-413**: 173-178.

409 Hedges LV (1981) Distribution theory for Glass's estimator of effect size and related
410 estimators. *Journal of Educational Statistic* **6**: 107-128.

411 Higgins JPT, Green S (2011) Cochrane Handbook for systematic reviews of
412 interventions version 5.1.0.

413 Hormiga JA, Almansa E, Sykes AV, Torres NV (2010) Model based optimization of
414 feeding regimens in aquaculture: application to the improvement of Octopus vulgaris
415 viability in captivity. *Journal of Biotechnology*.**149**: 209-14.

Iglesias J, Otero JJ, Moxica C, Fuentes L, Sánchez FJ (2004) The completed life cycle of the octopus (*Octopus vulgaris*, Cuvier) under culture conditions: paralarval rearing using *Artemia* and zoeae, and first data on juvenile growth up to 8 months of age. *Aquaculture International* **12**: 481-487.

Iglesias J, Fuentes L, Sánchez J, Otero JJ, Moxica C, Lago MJ (2006) First feeding of *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, 1797 paralarvae using Artemia: effect of prey size, prey density and feeding frecuency. *Aquaculture* **261**: 817-822.

Iglesias J, Sánchez FJ, Bersano JGF, Carrasco JF, Dhont J, Fuentes L *et al.* (2007) Rearing of *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae: Present status, bottlenecks and trends. *Aquaculture* **266**: 1-15.

Iglesias J, Fuentes L (2013) Research on the production of hatchery-reared juveniles of cephalopods with special reference to the common octopus (Octopus vulgaris). In: Allan G, Burnell G (eds) *Advances in aquaculture hatchery technology,* pp. 374-403. Woodhead Publishing Series in Food Science, UK.

Iglesias J, Pazos G, Fernández J, Sánchez FJ, Otero JJ, Domingues P, *et al.* (2014a) The effects of using crab zoeae (*Maja brachydactyla*) on growth and biochemical composition of *Octopus vulgaris* (Cuvier 1797) paralarvae. *Aquaculture International* **22**: 1041-1051.

Iglesias J, Fuentes L, Villanueva R (2014b) Cephalopod culture. Springer Ed. 494pp

Itami K, Izawa Y, Maeda S, Nakai K (1963) Notes on the laboratory culture of octopus larvae. *Bulletin of the Japanese Society of Scientific Fisehries* **29**: 514-520.

Kanazawa A, Shunsuke K (1994) Lipid nutrition of spiny lobster *Panulirus japonicus* (Decapoda, Palinuridae): a review. *Crustaceana* **67**: 226-232.

Koven WM, Tandler A, Sklan D, Kissil GW (1993) The association of eicosapentanoic and docosahexanoic acids in the main phospholipids of different age *Sparus aurata* larvae with growth. *Aquaculture* **116**: 71-82.

Kurihara A, Okumura LS, Iwamoto A and Takeuchi T (2006) Feeding pacific sand eel enhances DHA level in common Octopus paralarvae. *Aquaculture Science* 54: 413-420.

Martín V, Reis D, García-Herrero I, Rodríguez C, Riera R, Sykes A, *et al.* (2011) Composición nutricional de presas para su uso en la alimentación de paralarvas de pulpo común (*Octopus vulgaris*). *Actas XIII Congreso Nacional de Acuicultura, Casteldefels, Barcelona.*

Monroig Ó, Tocher DR, Navarro JC (2013) Biosynthesis of polyunsaturated fatty acids in marine invertebrates: recent advances in molecular mechanisms. *Marine Drugs* **11**: 3998-4018.

Morillo-Velarde PS, Cerezo-Valverde J, García-García B (2014) Utilization of diets with different fish oil content in common octopus (Octopus vulgaris Cuvier, 1797) and resulting changes in its biochemical composition. *Aquaculture Research* doi: 10.1111/are.12439

Morote E, Rodríguez M, Mancera JM, Moyano FJ, Muñoz JL (2005) Las enzimas digestivas como indicadores del estado nutricional en paralarvas de pulpo *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, 1797. *Boletín Instituto. Español de Oceanografía* **21**: 177-186.

Moxica C, Linares F, Otero JJ, Iglesias J, Sánchez FJ (2002) Cultivo intensivo de paralarvas de pulpo, *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, 1797, en tanques de 9 m^3. *Boletín Instituto Español de Oceanografía* **18**: 31-36.

Moxica C, Fuentes L, Hernández J, Iglesias J, Lago MJ, Otero JJ *et al.* (2006) Efecto de *Nannchloropsis* sp. en la supervivencia y crecimiento de paralarvas de pulpo *Octopus vulgaris*, *IX Foro dos Recursos Mariños e da Acuicultura das Rías Galegas*, O Grove, Spain.

Navarro JC, Amat F, Sargent JR (1993) The lipids of the cysts of freshwater- and marine-type Artemia. *Aquaculture* **109**: 327-336.

Navarro JC, Villanueva R (2000) Lipid and fatty acid composition of early stages of cephalopods: an approach to their lipid requirements. *Aquaculture* **183**: 161-177.

Navarro JC, Villanueva R (2003) The fatty acid composition of *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae reared with live and inert food: deviation from their natural fatty acid profile. *Aquaculture* **219**: 613-631.

O'Dor RK, Mangold K, Boucher-Rodoni R, Wells MJ, Wells J (1984) Nutrient absorption, storage and remobilization in *Octopus vulgaris*. *Marine Behaviour and Physiology* **11**: 239-258.

Okumura S, Kurihara A, Iwamoto A, Takeuchi T (2005) Improved survival and growth in *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae by feeding large type *Artemia* and Pacific sand eel, *Ammodytes personatus*. *Aquaculture* **244**: 147-157.

Olsen Y, Evjemo JO, Kjørsvik E, Larssen H, Li K, Overrein I, Rainuzzo J (2014) DHA content in dietary phospholipids affects DHA content in phospholipids of cod larvae and larval performance. *Aquaculture* **428-429**: 203-214.

Reis DB, García-Herrero I, Riera R, Felipe. BC, Rodríguez. C, Sykes. AV, Martín MV, Andrade JP, Almansa E (2014a) An insight on *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae lipid requirements under rearing conditions. *Aquaculture Nutrition* doi: 10.1111/anu.12205.

Reis DB, Acosta NG, Almansa E, Navarro JC, Tocher DR, Monroig O, *et al.* (2014b) *In vivo* metabolism of unsaturated fatty acid in *Octopus vulgaris* hatchlings determined by incubation with 14C-labelled fatty acids added directly to seawater as protein complexes. *Aquaculture* **431**: 28-33.

Roura A, González AF, Redd K, Guerra A (2012) Molecular prey identification in wild *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae. *Marine Biology* **159**: 1335-1345.

Salhi M, Hernández-Cruz CM, Bessonart M, Izquierdo MS, Fernández-Palacios H (1999) Effect of different dietary polar lipid levels and different n-3 HUFA content in polar lipids on gut and liver histological structure of gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*) larvae. *Aquaculture* **179**: 253-263.

Seixas P (2009) Composición bioquímica y crecimiento de paralarvas de pulpo (*Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, 1797), alimentadas con juveniles de *Artemia* enriquecidos con microalgas y otros suplementos nutricionales. PhD Thesis, University of Santiago de Compostela, p 279. ISBN: 978-84-9887-253–8.

Seixas P, Rey-Méndez M, Valente LMP, Otero A (2010a) High DHA content in Artemia is ineffective to improve *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae rearing. *Aquaculture* **300**: 156-162.

Seixas P, Otero A, Valente LMP, Dias J, Rey-Méndez M (2010b) Growth and fatty acid composition of *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae fed with enriched Artemia or co-fed with an inert diet. *Aquaculture International* **18**: 1121-1135.

Socorro J, Roo FJ, Izquierdo MS, Garcia J, Carrom M (2004) Effect of different live prey *Grapsus grapsus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Plagussia depressa* Fabricius, 1775 and *Xantho poressa* Olivi, 1792 zoeas over histology and biochemical composition of common

507 octopus, *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, 1797 paralarvae. XI International Symposium on
508 nutrition and feeding in fish. Phuket, Thailand.

509 Sorgeloos P, Dhert P, Candreva P (2001) Use of the brine shrimp, *Artemia* spp. in
510 marine fish larviculture. *Aquaculture* **200**: 147-159.

511 Takeuchi T (2014) Progress on larval and juvenile nutrition to improve the quality and
512 health of seawater fish: a review. *Fisheries Science* **80**: 389-403.

513 Tocher DR (2010) Fatty acid requirements in ontogeny of marine and freshwater fish.
514 *Aquaculture Research* **41**: 717-732.

515 Viciano E, Iglesias J, Lago MJ, Sánchez FJ, Otero JJ, Navarro JC (2011) Fatty acid
516 composition of polar and neutral lipid fractions of *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, 1797
517 paralarvae reared with enriched on-grown Artemia. *Aquaculture Research* **42**: 704-709.

518 Villanueva R (1994) Decapod crab zoeae as food for rearing cephalopod paralarvae.
519 *Aquaculture* **128**: 143-152.

520 Villanueva R (1995) Experimental rearing and growth of planktonic Octopus vulgaris
521 from hatchling to settlement. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **52**:
522 2639-2650.

523 Villanueva R, Koueta N, Riba J, Boucaud-Camou E (2002) Growth and proteolytic
524 activity of *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae with different food rations during first feeding,
525 using *Artemia* nauplii and compound diets. *Aquaculture* **205**: 269-286.

526 Villanueva R, Riba J, Ruíz-Capillas, González AV, Baeta M (2004) Amino acid
527 composition of early stages of cephalopods and effect of amino acid dietary treatments
528 on *Octopus vulgaris* paralarvae. *Aquaculture* **242**: 455-478.

529 Villanueva R, Bustamante P (2006) Composition in essential and non-essential elements
530 of early stages of cephalopods and dietary effects on the elemental profiles of *Octopus*
531 *vulgaris* paralarvae. *Aquaculture* **261**: 225-240.

532 Villanueva R, Norman MD (2008) Biology of the planktonic stages of benthic
533 octopuses. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review* **46**: 105-202.

534 Villanueva R, Escudero JM, Deulofeu R, Bozzano A, Casoliva C (2009) Vitamin A and
535 E content in early stages of cephalopods and their dietary effects in *Octopus vulgaris*
536 paralarvae. *Aquaculture* **286**: 277-282.

537 Vonk HJ (1962) Emulgators in the digestive fluids of invertebrates. *Archives of*
538 *Physiology and Biochemistry* **70**: 67-85.

539 Walker E, Hernandez AV, Kattan MW (2008) Meta-analysis: Its strengths and
540 Limitations. *Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine* **75**: 431-439.

541

542

543

544

Tables

Table 1. Studies included in meta-analysis

Nº study	CONTROL			EXPERIMENTAL				
	Prey 1	DW (mg)	N	Prey 2	DW (mg)	N	Age	Ref.
1	A	0.82 ± 0.15	30	A	0.80 ± 0.36	15	30	PE
2	A	0.94 ± 0.15	5	A	1.21 ± 0.25	5	30	"
3	A	1.47 ± 0.36	8	A	2.38 ± 0.35	8	30	"
4	A	0.66 ± 0.07	11	A	0.76 ± 0.22	10	30	"
5	A	0.41 ± 0.05	15	A	0.45 ± 0.05	15	14	"
6	A	0.48 ± 0.08	30	A	0.47 ± 0.08	30	14	"
7	A	0.60 ± 0.11	30	A	0.67 ± 0.14	30	14	"
8	A	0.43 ± 0.05	15	A	0.46 ± 0.07	16	14	"
9	A	0.33 ± 0.08	12	A	0.33 ± 0.05	12	14	"
10	A	0.33 ± 0.08	12	A	0.32 ± 0.36	12	14	"
11	A	0.48 ± 0.18	6	A	0.45 ± 0.17	6	14	"
12	A	0.48 ± 0.18	6	GZ	0.58 ± 0.11	6	14	"
13	A	0.77 ± 0.12	30	MZ	1.11 ± 0.13	30	14	"
14	A	0.78 ± 0.12	30	MZ	1.31 ± 0.30	30	30	"
15	A	0.31 ± 0.02	30	PZ	0.34 ± 0.04	30	9	"
16	A	0.22 ± 0.03	40	PZ	0.27 ± 0.02	40	9	Reis *et al.* 2014a
17	A	0.22 ± 0.03	40	GZ	0.30 ± 0.03	40	9	Reis *et al.* 2014a
18	A	0.90 ± 0.03	6	PZ/Ac	1.10 ± 0.08	6	30	Estévez *et al.* 2009
19	A	0.83 ± 0.09	30	A	0.80 ± 0.10	30	25	Seixas, 2009
20	A	0.68 ± 0.02	24	A	0.68 ± 0.03	24	20	Villanueva *et al.* 2004
21	A	0.65 ± 0.02	24	A	0.57 ± 0.02	24	20	Villanueva *et al.* 2004
22	A	0.83 ± 0.09	30	A	0.87 ± 0.08	30	25	Seixas, 2009
23	A	0.50 ± 0.07	15	A	0.44 ± 0.06	15	15	Seixas *et al.* 2010
24	A	0.80 ± 0.09	30	A	0.74 ± 0.10	30	25	Seixas *et al.* 2010
25	A	1.62 ± 0.39	20	A	0.93 ± 0.08	20	30	Fuentes *et al.* 2011
26	A	1.76 ± 0.28	10	A	1.88 ± 0.22	10	28	Viciano *et al.* 2011

Abbreviations: DW: dry weight. N: number of data. Age: paralarvae days old. Ref.: bibliographic references/ PE: data of performed experiments. A: *Artemia*. GZ: *Grapsus adscensionis* zoea. MZ: *Maja brachydactyla* zoea. PZ: *Palaemon sp.* zoea. Ac: *Acartia sp*.
Data are presented as mean±SD (Standard Deviation)

554 **Table 2. Rearing conditions of performed experiments**

Nº study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Research Center	VG	VG	IR	TF	TF	IR	IR	TF	TF	TF	TF	TF	VG	VG	TF
Trial days	30	30			14			14	14	14	14	14	14	30	9
Tank volume (L)	800	500			100			100	100	100	100	100	500	500	100
Tank colour	B	B			B			B	W-B	W-B	W-B	W-B	B	B	W-B
Flow (mL·s^{-1})[†]	56	17			10			10	4	4	1	1	56	56	1
Renovation (h)	[‡]	14			14			14	24	24	24	24	[‡]	[‡]	24
Aeration	C	C			L			L	L	L	L	L	C	C	L
Skimmer	Yes	Yes			-			-	-	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-
Exit mesh (µm)	500	500			500			363	363	363	363	363	500	500	363
Light (h)	12	12			12			12	12	12	12	12	24	24	12
Light (lux)	1000	700			200			200	200	200	200	200	1000	1000	200
Light type	F2	F2			F1			F1	F1	F1	I-B	I-B	F2	F2	I-B
Replicates (nº tanks)	2	3			6			5	4	4	6	6	2	2	3
Paralarval density (ind·L^{-1})	5	6			10			10	3	3	3	3	10	11	1.5
Green water sp.	I+N	N			-	-	N	-	-	-	Ch	Ch	I+N	I+N	Ch
Green water (10^6 cells/mL)	0.3+1	0.25			-	-	1	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.3+1	0.3+1	0.2
Temperature (°C)	21.5	21.5	21.5	22.7	19.8	21.5	21.5	22.1	24	24	21.6	21.6	21.5	21.5	21
Salinity (PSU)	35.0	35.0	35.5	36.8	36.8	35.0	35.0	36.8	36.8	36.8	36.8	36.8	35.0	35.0	36.8

555 *Abbreviations:* IR: Research & Technology Food & Agriculture Center. TF: Oceanographic Center of the Canary Islands. VG: Oceanographic
556 Center of Vigo. B: black. W-B: white bottom and black walls. C: Gentle and central. L: Gentle and lateral. F1: OSRAM Dulux superstar
557 21W/840. F2: OSRAM Dulux Superstar 36W/840. I-B: 40 W Incandescent bulb. I: *Isochrysis galbana*. N: *Nannchloropsis* sp. Ch: *Chlorella* sp.
558 *Symbols:* [†] Closed seawater system was just used in IR centre. [‡] Open 4h from 5th to 15th and 24h until 30th day.
559

Table 3. Preys enrichment and feeding

Nº Study		1†	2†	3†	4†	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14†	15
Research Center		VG	VG	IR	TF	TF	IR	IR	TF	TF	TF	TF	TF	VG	VG	TF
Trial days		30	30			15			15	15	15	15	15	15	30	9
CONTROL																
Larval Feeding	**Prey**	AF	AG‡			AG‡			AG‡	AG	AG	AG	AG	AG	AG	AG
	Prey age§	1/4	1/4			1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1/4	8
	Feeding rate	0.3/0.3	0.3/0.15			0.3			0.3	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.5-1	0.5-1	0.04
Prey Enrichment	**Diet**	I/N	I/ N			I			I	N	N	N	N	I	I/ N	T
	Diet concentration	1/10	1/10			1			1	63	63	10	10	0.5	0.5/10	0.4
	Prey density	10/5	10/5			8			50	250	250	7	7	0.5	0.5/0.5	10
	time (h)	20/20	20/20			20			20	8	8	20	20	20	20/20	20
EXPERIMENTAL																
Larval Feeding	**Prey**	AF	AG‡			AG‡			AG‡	AG	AG	AG	GZ	MZ+AG¶	MZ+AG¶,»	PZ+AG¶
	Prey age §	1/4	1/4			1			1	1	1	8	1	1	1	1
	Feeding rate	0.3/0.3	0.3/0.15			0.3			0.3	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.01	0.01/0.001	0.001
Prey Enrichment	**Diet**	LC/LC	LC/LC			LC			I+LC	LC	Nr	N	-	-	-	-
	Diet concentration	0.6	0.6			0.6			1+0.6	0.6	0.24	10	-	-	-	-
	Prey density	125/50	250/50			250			50	250	250	7	-	-	-	-
	time (h)	3/3••	8/6••			8••			20▲	8••	8	20	-	-	-	-

Abbreviations: IR,TF,VG, I and N: see Footnote Table 2. AF: *Artemia* AF. AG: *Artemia* EG. AG‡: *Artemia* Sept-Art EG. T: *Tetraselmis chuii*. GZ: *Grapsus adscensionis* zoea. MZ: *Maja brachydactyla* zoea. PZ: *Palaemon elegans* zoea. LC: Lécithine Marine Naturelle LC60 ($g \cdot L^{-1}$). Nr: Haematococcus pluvialis ($g \cdot L^{-1}$).

Units: Prey age (days). Feeding rate ($invidual \cdot mL^{-1} \cdot day^{-1}$). Diet concentration (Phyto (I. N and T): $x10^6$ $cells \cdot mL^{-1}$/other enrichments (LC and Nr): $g \cdot L^{-1}$). Prey density ($individual \cdot mL^{-1}$).

Symbols: †Experiments carried out in two phases (0-15/16-30days). § See Table 4 for the details of the on-growing *Artemia* (≥4days-old). ¶ Co-feeding: values showed below correspond to Zoea. *Artemia* values as the control treatment. »Gemma diamond 0.8 from 24 days-old (1g/day). •*Artemia* was starved for 12h before enrichment. ▲ 12h with I + 8h with I +LC.

570 **Table 4. On-growing *Artemia* parameters**

Nº study	1	2	3	4	11	14	15
Research Center	VG	VG	IR	TF	TF	VG	TF
Strains	AF	AG‡			AG	AG	AG
Prey age	3	3			7	3-5	7
Prey density	5	5			10	5	10
Diet	I	I			T	I	T
Diet concentration	4	4			4	5	4

571 *Abbreviations:* see Footnote table 3

572 *Units:* see Footnote Table 3. Diet concentration: (10^5 cells·mL^{-1}).

573 **Figure legends**

574

575 **Figure 1.** Meta-analysis results comparing effect of paralarvae fed crustacean zoeae (n=7) *vs*
576 *Artemia* (n=19). They are presented as effect (symbol) plus 95% confidence interval (horizontal
577 bar). Heterogeneity between studies (Q-test values) has been included.

578

579 **Figure 2.** Meta-analysis results comparing effect of paralarvae fed different zoeae species
580 (n=7). They are presented as effect (symbols) plus 95% confidence interval (horizontal bar).
581 Heterogeneity between studies (Q-test values) has been included.

582

583 **Figure 3.** Meta-analysis results comparing the effect of paralarvae fed marine phospholipids
584 (Marine lecithin LC60) (n=9) *vs* other *Artemia* enrichments (n=10). They are presented as effect
585 (symbols) plus 95% confidence interval (horizontal bar). Heterogeneity between studies (Q-test
586 values) has been included.



Figure 1. Meta-analysis results comparing effect of paralarvae fed crustacean zoeae (n=7) vs Artemia (n=19). They are presented as effect (symbol) plus 95% confidence interval (horizontal bar). Heterogeneity between studies (Q-test values) has been included.
135x78mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Figure 2. Meta-analysis results comparing effect of paralarvae fed different zoeae species (n=7). They are presented as effect (symbols) plus 95% confidence interval (horizontal bar). Heterogeneity between studies (Q-test values) has been included.
128x76mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Figure 3. Meta-analysis results comparing the effect of paralarvae fed marine phospholipids (Marine lecithin LC60) (n=9) vs other Artemia enrichments (n=10). They are presented as effect (symbols) plus 95% confidence interval (horizontal bar). Heterogeneity between studies (Q-test values) has been included.
128x77mm (96 x 96 DPI)